



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,413	07/25/2006	Jakob Gerrit Nijboer	NL 040129	1739
24737	7590	04/04/2011	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			ORTIZ CRIADO, JORGE L	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2627	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
04/04/2011	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vera.kublanov@philips.com
debbie.henn@philips.com
marianne.fox@philips.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/597,413	NIJBOER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JORGE L. ORTIZ CRIADO	2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-19 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/16/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 in that there is sufficient discussion in the specification and the figures to support the subject matter of "at least one area".

It is noted that the rejections is not questioning support for a particular feature recited in the claims.

The raised question regards the antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 1, 6 and 17 recites the limitation "which of selected ones of said at least one area" and "selected ones of said at least one area" respectively.

The supposed selection appears to be a process/methods step or the like which some how take place, an such cannot be found in the claim. The claims does not set forth any selection, tt is not clear what, when or how a selection is made in the claims to such "each of said at least one area".

Furthermore, only one area is required by the claim, making unclear as to what or when a selection of the "each of said at least one area" is being, was or were made. There is nothing in the claims that leads to a selection of an "each" of the "of said at least one area".

Applicant argues the that Takahashi et al. fails to disclose any association of the DMW's in the form of an area, associated with a first one of said at least one area, comprising signals indicating which of selected ones of said at least one area for storing disc management

information is in use, each of said signals being related to a corresponding one of said at least one area for storing disc management information.

As acknowledged by the Applicant, only one area is required by the claim. Takahashi meets and discloses the one an only required area predicated to be interpreted by the claimed invention, and where clearly discloses “an area” 14 “that is associated” and corresponding with every **at least one** (i.e. each) area 21/15; DMWA, which is for disc management information. Area (14) comprising signals indicating that such area for defect management information is **in use**, since the recording/reproducing apparatus obtains latest DMWA by the associating it's corresponding area 14. Takahashi et al clearly specifies that recorded area 14, which when recorded implies having such signals that defines neighboring areas between the recorded latest DMWA (in use) and unrecorded DMWA (not in use). Contrary to Applicant's assertion, Takahashi et al do in fact discloses in forma of an area associated because also area 14 contains the defect list positional information for each of its corresponding “selected” DMWA.

As acknowledged by the Applicant, Takahashi discloses an area 14 that is associated with a single area 21/15 and that each area 21/15 has its own corresponding area 14, that corresponds to the single one and only one area required by the broadest reasonable interpretation predicated by the claim.

Applicant's arguments are not found compelling.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8 and 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 6 and 17 recites the limitation “which of selected ones of said at least one area” and “selected ones of said at least one area” respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is not clear what, when or how a selection is made in the claims to such “each of said at least one area”. Furthermore, only one area is required by the claim, making unclear as to what or when a selection of the “each of said at least one area” is being, was or were made. There is nothing in the claims that leads to a selection of an “each” of the “of said at least one area”.

Corresponding dependent claims fall together accordingly

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

**Claim 1-8 and 10-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by
Takahashi et al. WO2004/059648.**

As per claim 1, Takahashi et al discloses a record carrier (1) comprising at least one area (21/15; DMWA) for storing disc management information, said record carrier further comprising an area (14), associated with a first one of said at least one area, comprising signals indicating which of “selected ones of each of” said at least one area for storing disc management information is in use, each of said signals being related to a corresponding one of said at least one area for storing disc management information (see Figs. 2, 5, 6, 8; corresponding description for the drawings; for example see page 27 line 16 to page 36 line 4).

As per claim 2, Takahashi et al discloses wherein the area comprising signals indicating which of said at least one area for storing disc management information is in use is located inside said a first one of said at least one area for storing disc management information (see #14; Fig. 2).

As per claim 3, Takahashi et al discloses wherein the area comprising signals indicating which of said at least one area for storing disc management information is in use is located adjacent to said first one of said at least one area for storing disc management information (see #14; Fig. 2).

As per claim 4, Takahashi et al discloses wherein the signals indicating which of said at least one area for storing disc management information is in use are clusters on said record carrier (1 block; see page 29, lines 10-11), said clusters comprising marks for indicating a first status of said areas for storing disc management information and comprising no marks for indicating a second status of said areas for storing disc management information (see Figs. 6, 8; page 28 lines 9-20; page 29 lines 10-20).

As per claim 5, Takahashi et al discloses the first status indicates that a corresponding area of said at least one area for storing disc management information is in use (See for instance and for example 1e Fig. 8 (a), DMWA # 1, and the second status indicates that the areas for storing disc management information are not in use (DMWA#2).

As per claim 6, is drawn to the method of recording the above record carrier having limitations similar to the ones treated above, and is rejected for the same reasons of anticipation (see Fig. 5 process of how the areas are found and retrieved).

As per claim 7, Takahashi et al discloses wherein the step of accessing the area comprising signals indicating which of said at least one area for storing disc management information are in use consist referencing to a predefined location on the record carrier (see Fig. 6).

As per claim 8, Takahashi et al discloses wherein the step of retrieving the disc management information comprises retrieving pointer information from a predefined location in the determined last area for storing disc management information in use, and subsequently retrieving the disc management information by using said pointer information (see Fig. 5; step #602; 603).

As per claims 10, 11, 14, 15, Takahashi et al discloses "explicitly" identifies said first one of at least one area (as provided by the search in for example step 601 of Fig. 5) and "implicitly" identifies said first one of at least one area (as provided by the search jumping to a boarder between the recorded and unrecorded area of Fig. 6).

As per claims 12, 13 and 16, Takahashi et al discloses whether the first one of said at least one area and the area comprising the signals are contained at a "known region" of said record carrier (see Fig. 2; known regions defined; for instance and one possible example Lead-in region).

Claims 17-19, recites limitations similar to the ones treated above and are rejected for the same reasons of anticipation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06/18/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the that Takahashi et al. fails to disclose any association of the DMW's in the form of an area, associated with a first one of said at least one area, comprising signals indicating which of selected ones of each of said at least one area for storing disc management information is in use, each of said signals being related to a corresponding one of said at least one area for storing disc management information.

Takahashi et al clearly discloses "an area" 14 "that is associated" and corresponding with every **at least one** (i.e. each) area 21/15; DMWA, which is for disc management information. Area (14) comprising signals indicating that such area for defect management information is **in use**, since the recording/reproducing apparatus obtains latest DMWA by the associating it's corresponding area 14. Takahashi et al clearly specifies that recorded area 14, which when recorded implies having such signals that defines neighboring areas between the recorded latest DMWA (in use) and unrecorded DMWA (not in use). Contrary to Applicant's assertion, Takahashi et al do in fact discloses in forma of an area associated because also area 14 contains the defect list positional information for each of its corresponding "selected" DMWA.

Closing Comments/Remarks

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JORGE L. ORTIZ CRIADO whose telephone number is (571)272-7624. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri 10:00 am- 6:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne R. Young can be reached on (571) 272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jorge L Ortiz-Criado/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2627